

**EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE VERIFICATION OF DECENTRALIZED
WASTEWATER NUTRIENT REDUCTION TECHNOLOGIES FOR
INDIVIDUAL HOMES AND SMALL COMMUNITIES**

**DRAFT – NOVEMBER 1, 1999
REVISED – JANUARY 7, 2000
REVISED – MAY 10, 2000**

Prepared by:

**The Environmental Technology Evaluation Center (EvTEC)
1015 15th Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005-2605
202-842-0555**

For:

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection

and

**US Environmental Protection Agency
Environmental Technology Verification Program**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EvTEC acknowledges the support of all those who helped prepare and review this evaluation plan. In particular, we would like to thank Ms. Norma Lewis, EPA ETV Project Manager, and Ms. Lauren Drees, EPA ETV, Project QA/QC Manager, of EPA's National Risk Management Research Laboratory in Cincinnati, Ohio.

We would also like to thank the Technology Evaluation Panel which included: Mr. David Althoff, PA Department of Environmental Protection, Mr. John Blount, Harris County, Texas, Mr. Larry Hepner, Delaware Valley College, Dr. Anish Jantrania, Virginia Department of Health, Mr. Kenneth Keil, Parsons Engineering Science, Mr. Richard Piluk, Anne Arundel County Health Department, Mr. Richard Rose, New Mexico Environmental Department, Dr. Bob Rubin, North Carolina State University – BAE, Mr. Thomas Stevens, NSF International, Inc, Ms. Susan K. Weaver, PA Department of Environmental Protection, Mr. Neil Weinstein, Low Impact Development Center, Ms. Allison Wiedeman, EPA/Chesapeake Bay Program, Mr. Duane Wilding, Maryland Environmental Service, and Mr. Eric Winkler, University of Massachusetts

In addition, we want to acknowledge the assistance and participation of Mr. Thomas Stevens and Ms. Maren Roush of NSF International, Inc for providing a detailed overview and external review of this document. We also want to thank Mr. Stuart L. Rosenthal, P.E and Mr. Richard L. Hinkle, P.E. of Gilmore & Associates, Inc. for their efforts as consultants on the development of this evaluation plan.

FORWARD

This Evaluation Plan for Decentralized Wastewater Nutrient Reduction Technologies for Individual Homes and Small Communities has been developed by the Environmental Technology Evaluation Center (EvTEC) for the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) and the U.S EPA.

EvTEC is a service center of the Civil Engineering Research Foundation (CERF), a research arm of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). EvTEC was formed through a cooperative agreement with the EPA's Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program. EvTEC's mission is to verify the performance of new, market-ready environmental technologies and products, and to transfer the results of these verifications to those who recommend, specify, approve, or purchase these technologies and products, such as federal and state regulators, facility owners and operators and consulting engineers. Throughout its three-year history, EvTEC has endeavored to work directly with state agencies to identify their specific technical needs and, where appropriate, to build collaborative programs to evaluate technologies that directly meet those needs. The intent is to help the states work together to solve common problems, and to foster a spirit of collaboration on environmental improvements nationwide.

In March 1999, the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) entered into an agreement with the Environmental Technology Evaluation Center (EvTEC) to develop and implement a program for the performance verification of technologies designed to remove nitrogen from household wastewater. The technologies were defined as decentralized cluster systems that could treat flows produced by a single residence or small community. By using decentralized systems of this sort, PA DEP believes that significant energy savings and groundwater protection can be realized.

PA DEP has been proactive in identifying its environmental challenges, and searching for technological solutions to address them. One of the Commonwealth's ongoing challenges is the management of wastewater from rural communities. Often, the construction of a conventional, large-scale treatment plant in such areas is cost-prohibitive, and its alternative—piping of untreated wastewater to large, centrally-located plants—is both expensive and energy-intensive. In many cases, small-scale on-lot disposal systems (OLDS) have been installed for individual households. Currently, over one million Pennsylvania residents rely on OLDS to manage their household wastewater. Though OLDS are effective in some cases, in other cases economies of scale and energy efficiencies could be realized by using a small, decentralized facility capable of treating a greater volume of wastes than conventional OLDS. Such a system, particularly if it effectively removed nitrogen from the waste stream, would eliminate the concern for discharging nitrogen-rich wastes, and would also eliminate the need to pipe to or build conventional larger-scale facilities. The market for these low-flow system is expected to be substantial in the Commonwealth, as almost a third of Pennsylvania's 12 million residents live in rural areas.

To begin to address these concerns, PA DEP has collaborated with Delaware Valley College over the past four years to evaluate the effectiveness of on-lot disposal systems (OLDS) for wastewater for single-family dwellings. The goal of this project was to catalogue technologies that would sufficiently treat wastewater in small, onsite systems so that no further downstream treatment was necessary. This collaborative effort has been widely recognized as a success. PA DEP wishes to maintain the momentum of this effort by expanding it to include the evaluation of energy-efficient technologies that are scaled up to address the needs of small communities and/or small-scale agricultural operations, both of which are numerous in the Commonwealth.

Pennsylvania's environmental challenges are not theirs alone. Indeed, they are shared by many states and jurisdictions. A program designed to identify, verify, and deploy nutrient reduction technologies for wastewater would benefit the nation by saving energy and improving local environmental conditions. By establishing this program with EvTEC, PA DEP would be on the cutting edge of technological research and deployment in this area, and would be well-positioned to launch new group evaluations for other technologies that save energy and prevent pollution.

EvTEC Technical Evaluation Panel

David Althoff	PA Department of Environmental Protection
John Blount	Harris County, Texas
Larry Hepner	Delaware Valley College
Dr. Anish Jantrania	Virginia Department of Health
Kenneth L. Keil	Parsons Engineering Science
Richard Piluk	Anne Arundel County Health Department
Richard Rose	New Mexico Environmental Department
Dr. Bob Rubin	US Environmental Protection Agency
Thomas Stevens	NSF International, Inc.
Susan K. Weaver	PA Department of Environmental Protection
Neil Weinstein	Low Impact Development Center
Allison Wiedeman	EPA/Chesapeake Bay Program
Duane Wilding	Maryland Environmental Service
Eric Winkler	University of Massachusetts

EvTEC Staff

Will Kirksey, P.E.	Director
Jenise Dunn	Project Manager
Kristi Dunn	Research Engineer

Consultants

Stuart L. Rosenthal, P.E.	Gilmore & Associates, Inc.
Richard L. Hinkle, P.E.	Gilmore & Associates, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Evaluation Objectives	1
1.3 Scope of Technology Coverage.....	2
1.4 Responsible Parties and Roles.....	2
CHAPTER 2.0 TESTING CONDITIONS	5
2.1 Verification Test Site Characteristics	5
2.2 Vendor Test Plan.....	6
CHAPTER 3.0 TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.....	7
3.1 Performance Testing/Verification Requirements.....	7
3.1.1 Duration	7
3.1.2 Analytical Parameters	7
3.1.3 Influent Flow Pattern	9
3.1.3.1 Small Residential Systems (up to 1,500 gpd)	9
3.1.3.2 Other Systems (1,500-10,000 gpd)	10
3.1.4 Stress Testing.....	10
3.1.4.1 Small Residential Systems (up to 1,500 gpd)	10
3.1.4.2 Other Systems (1,500-10,000 gpd)	11
3.1.5 Sampling Requirements	11
3.1.5.1 Location	11
3.1.5.2 Frequency.....	12
3.1.5.3 Type	12
3.1.6 Sampling Procedures	12
3.1.6.1 Sample Collection Procedures	12
3.1.6.2 Sample Labeling and Designation	13
3.1.6.3 Sample Packing/Shipping Procedures.....	13
3.1.6.4 Sample Chain of Custody	13
3.1.6.5 Field Records and Documentation	13
3.1.6.6 Waste Management Plan.....	14
3.1.7 Analytical Procedures	14
3.1.8 Additional Performance Claims.....	15
3.1.8.1 Alarm Systems	15
3.1.8.2 Other	15
3.2 Operation and Maintenance Considerations	15
3.2.1 General.....	15
3.2.2 Mechanical Components.....	15
3.2.3 Electrical/Instrumentation Components.....	16
3.2.4 Chemical Feed Components	16
3.2.5 Other Components	16
3.2.6 Byproducts or Residuals	16
3.2.7 Level of Operator Skill and Attention Required	16

3.2.8	Electrical Usage	17
3.2.9	Chemical Usage	17
3.3	Environmental Considerations.....	17
3.3.1	Noise	17
3.3.2	Odors	17
3.3.3	Other	17
3.4	Miscellaneous.....	18
3.4.1	Proprietary Issues.....	18
4.0	QUALITY ASSURANCE / QUALITY CONTROL (QA/QC)	19
4.1	QA/QC Objectives.....	19
4.2	Intended Uses of Acquired Data	20
4.3	Analytical Quality Levels and Quality Control Levels	20
4.4	Quality Control Indicators	20
4.4.1	Precision	20
4.4.2	Accuracy	20
4.4.3	Representativeness.....	21
4.4.4	Completeness	21
4.4.5	Comparability	22
4.5	Water Quality and Operational Control Checks.....	22
4.5.1	Water Quality Data	22
4.5.1.1	Spiked Samples	22
4.5.1.2	Method Blanks	23
4.5.1.3	Travel Blanks	23
4.5.1.4	Field Duplicate Samples	23
4.5.1.5	Performance Evaluation Samples	23
4.5.2	Quality Control for Equipment Operation	23
4.6	Corrective Actions.....	24
5.0	DATA REDUCTION, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING.....	25
5.1	Data Reduction	25
5.2	Data Review	25
5.2.1	Level 1 Technical Data Review	25
5.2.2	Level 2 Technical Data Review	26
5.2.3	Level 3 Administrative Data Review.....	26
5.3	Data Validation.....	26
5.4	Data Reporting	27
5.5	Project Data Flow and Transfer	27
5.6	Reports	27
5.6.1	Sampling Report	28

5.6.2	Data Summary Report	28
5.6.3	Quality Control and Analytical Report	28
5.7	Use of Existing Data	29

6.0 HEALTH AND SAFETY MEASURES..... 30

TABLES

Table I	Sampling Matrix
Table II	Optional Sampling

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Environmental Technology Verification Program, Existing Data: Policy and Process
------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

ACRONYMS

ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
BOD	biological oxygen demand
CBOD	carbonaceous biochemical oxygen demand
CERF	Civil Engineering Research Foundation
COC	chain-of-custody
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ETV	Environmental Technology Verification Program
EvTEC	Environmental Technology Evaluation Center
mg/L	milligrams per liter
NELAC	National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Council
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NSF	National Sanitation Foundation, International
OLDS	on-lot disposal system
PA DEP	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
PQL	practical quantitation limit
QA	quality assurance
QAPP	quality assurance project plan
QC	quality control
RF	response factor
RPD	relative percent difference
SOP	standard operating procedure
TKN	total Kjeldahl nitrogen

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Domestic wastewater contains various physical, chemical and bacteriological constituents, which require treatment prior to release to the environment. Various wastewater treatment processes exist which provide for the reduction of oxygen demanding materials, suspended solids and pathogenic organisms. Reduction of nutrients, principally phosphorous and nitrogen, has been practiced primarily since the 1960's at treatment plants where there is a specific need for nutrient reduction to protect the water quality and, hence, the uses of the receiving waters, whether ground water or surface water. The primary reasons for nutrient reduction are to protect water quality for drinking water purposes, as there is a drinking water standard for nitrite and nitrate, and to reduce the potential for eutrophication in nutrient sensitive surface waters by the reduction of nitrogen and/or phosphorus.

1.2 Evaluation Objectives

This Evaluation Plan has been developed to evaluate and verify nutrient reduction associated with decentralized wastewater treatment systems capable of treating domestic wastewater from individual homes and small communities having hydraulic capacities from approximately 400 gpd to 10,000 gpd. The following objectives apply:

- verify that the raw wastewater at the test site is representative of "normal" domestic wastewater for selected key parameters
- verify performance of the technology with respect to nutrient reduction while maintaining performance with respect to conventional parameters (i.e., BOD, CBOD₅, suspended solids, pH) under a specified influent flow pattern
- assess operation and maintenance considerations associated with the technology including an evaluation of the performance and reliability of various components, and measurement of the level of operator skill attention required
- measure cost factors associated with the use of the technology (cost effectiveness determinations, if desired, may require additional phases of testing)
- identify and assess environmental inputs and outputs (beyond effluent quality) including chemical usage, energy usage, generation of byproducts or residuals, noise, and odors
- establish and implement strict QA/QC methods and procedures during sampling, field and laboratory analyses, and acceptable procedures for the recording, reduction, review and reporting of analytical data generated

- assess additional claims by the Vendor, as described in the Test Plan, with respect to the technology performance

1.3 Scope of Technology Coverage

This Evaluation Plan has been developed to evaluate technologies that are capable of performing nutrient reduction on domestic wastewater from individual homes and small communities having hydraulic capacities from approximately 400 gpd to 10,000 gpd. Treatment processes employed may include physical, biological and/or chemical treatment steps. Technologies to be evaluated according to this evaluation plan may be factory assembled and commonly known as “package plants”, as opposed to field erected wastewater treatment plants. Nutrient reduction technologies may also include certain elements that are field erected/assembled such as tanks, piping, etc.

Natural systems involving features such as ponds, vegetation wetlands, free access or buried sand filters and soil systems may be evaluated using this evaluation plan as long as the system has a single discharge point from which a discreet sample may be taken.

1.4 Responsible Parties and Roles

The principal parties involved with an evaluation of a nutrient reduction technology under this evaluation plan may include the following:

- Verification Organization
For the remainder of this Evaluation Plan the Verification Organization will be referred to as the Environmental Technology Evaluation Center (EvTEC)
- Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP)
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
- Technical Panel
- Testing Organization
- Vendor
- Independent consultant

The primary roles and responsibilities of each party may include:

Verification Organization/EvTEC:

- coordinate with Testing Organization and Vendor to identify and secure a site for the technology verification
- coordinate with Testing Organization and Vendor relative to preparing a specific Test Plan
- review and approve Test Plan prior to commencement of testing
- direct the Testing Organization in the oversight of the evaluation and the laboratory testing associated with each technology verification
- review data generated during testing

- oversee the development of the Verification Report
- print and distribute the final documents (i.e. evaluation plan, verification report)
- perform quality assurance (QA) oversight of the sampling and analysis program outlined in this Evaluation Plan or designate this responsibility to another party
- select and contract with a qualified Testing Organization(s)/laboratory(ies) and perform appropriate QA

Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP)

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection assisted with the funding for the development of this evaluation plan.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

This Evaluation Plan was developed with quality assurance assistance from the Environmental Technology Verification (ETV) Program, which is overseen by the EPA Office of Research and Development.

Technical Panel:

- assisted in the development and approval this Evaluation Plan

Testing Organization:

- coordinate with EvTEC and Vendor to identify and secure a site for the technology verification
- coordinate with EvTEC and Vendor relative to preparing a specific Test Plan
- conduct the technology verification in accordance with the Test Plan and with direct oversight from EvTEC
- coordinate with and report to EvTEC during the technology verification process
- assume all roles and responsibilities of day-to-day coordination with the laboratory(ies), ensure the laboratory(ies) properly implement the Test Plan, resolve any quality concerns that may be encountered and report all findings to EvTEC
- provide analytical results of the technology evaluation to EvTEC
- if necessary, document changes in plans for testing and analysis, and notify EvTEC of any and all such changes before changes are executed

Note: The laboratory functions associated with verification testing may be carried out by either an independent commercial laboratory under contract with the Testing Organization or by a laboratory associated with the Testing Organization, in accordance with the specifications of EvTEC.

Vendor:

- coordinate with EvTEC and Testing Organization to identify and secure a site for the technology verification
- assist in preparing a specific Test Plan for the technology verification with EvTEC and the Testing Organization
- obtain approval of the Test Plan from EvTEC prior to commencement of testing
- provide a complete field-ready version of the technology of the selected capacity for verification and assist Testing Organization with installation at the test site
- provide start-up services and technical support to the Testing Organization as required during the period prior to the evaluation
- provide technical assistance to the Testing Organization during operation and monitoring of the equipment undergoing verification testing as requested
- remove equipment associated with the technology and any discarded items from the test site following termination of the verification evaluation
- provide funding for verification testing

Independent Consultant:

- review Test Plan for the technology verification prepared by the Vendor
- oversee testing, sampling and laboratory activities to verify compliance with the Test Plan for technology verification
- participate in Technical Panel activities
- assist in preparing the Verification Report and Statement
- perform other duties as assigned by EvTEC

Note: An independent consultant may be retained, if needed, to assist EvTEC in overseeing the technology verification.

CHAPTER 2.0 TESTING CONDITIONS

2.1 Verification Test Site Characteristics

Minimum requirements that would apply to a test site include the following:

- The wastewater must be “typical” domestic wastewater relative to key parameters such as BOD₅, suspended solids, TKN and phosphorus. Wastewater of weaker strength due to infiltration/inflow or wastewater of excessive strength due to industrial waste, restaurant wastewater, etc., is not acceptable.

Raw wastewater characteristics must fall within the following ranges based on a minimum of six (6) 24-hour composite samples collected at a minimum interval of one (1) week.

<u>Parameter</u>	<u>Concentration Range</u>
BOD	100-450 mg/L
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	150-500mg/L
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN) (as N)	25-70mg/L
Phosphorus (as P)	3-20mg/L
pH	6-9 units
Alkalinity (as CaCO ₃)	Greater than 60 mg/L (may require alkalinity addition)
Temperature	Greater than 10 °C and less than 30 °C

- The test site must have a suitable means and location for sampling of raw wastewater and a sampling arrangement to collect representative samples.
- The test site must be capable of controlled dosing to the technology being evaluated to simulate a diurnal flow variation and to allow for stress testing. The test site must have a sufficient flow of wastewater to accomplish the required controlled dosing pattern.
- The test site must be accessible, relative to operational control and oversight, and secure to prevent tampering by outside parties.
- The raw wastewater may be supplemented with nitrogen and/or phosphorus to better determine the nutrient reduction capabilities of the technology being evaluated, provided that considerations such as the carbon to nitrogen ratio, alkalinity concentration, etc. are taken into account. The Test Plan shall describe the means by which the influent, if necessary, will be supplemented.
- The test site must have a legal means of wastewater disposal of both the effluent from the testing operation and for any untreated wastewater generated when testing is not occurring.

- The test site must be capable of accommodating the start up period, testing period, stress testing and any additional testing activities, such as a determination of operations and maintenance requirements.

2.2 Vendor Test Plan

A detailed Test Plan shall be developed for every technology to be evaluated according to this evaluation plan. EvTEC, the Testing Organization and the Vendor shall all assist in the preparation of the Test Plan with final approval of the Test Plan given by EvTEC.

Test Plans should include the following sections, in addition to other sections specified by EvTEC:

- Title Page
- Forward
- Table Of Contents
- Executive Summary
- Abbreviations and Acronyms
- Introduction
- Technology Verification Testing Responsibilities
- Technology Capacity and Description
- Experimental Design
- Field Operation Procedures
- Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP)
- Data Management and Analysis
- Safety Plan

The Vendor shall provide at least the following items in the Test Plan:

- A brief statement of the water quality treatment objectives (what are the target nutrients);
- A statement of the technology's performance capabilities;
- Equipment and process description;
- A brief statement of the Test Plan objectives;
- Test location description;
- Operation and maintenance (O&M) manual(s); and
- Health and safety information relating to the equipment and the process.

Test Plan requirements are discussed in detail throughout this evaluation plan.

CHAPTER 3.0 TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS

3.1 Performance Testing/Verification Requirements

The following section discusses the technology evaluation requirements for two sets of systems: small residential systems (up to 1,500 gpd) and other systems (1,500 to 10,000 gpd). The duration and analytical parameters for both systems are the same, however, the influent flow pattern and stress testing will differ.

3.1.1 Duration

The duration of the evaluation period shall be a minimum of one (1) year following a maximum start-up period of eight (8) weeks. When the technology performance has stabilized during the start-up period, the Vendor shall advise the Testing Organization that the evaluation period can commence. This evaluation period duration will allow for an assessment of the impact of seasonal variations on performance. The duration shall be extended as required to allow for stress testing.

3.1.2 Analytical Parameters

The analytical parameters of interest for verifying system performance for nutrient reduction are noted in Table I, which includes the requirements for both raw influent and treated effluent samples. If the treatment process involves multiple stages, it may be appropriate to collect samples at intermediate points. The Test Plan shall clearly indicate the sampling points for the technology being evaluated.

If the Vendor does not intend to seek verification with respect to reduction of a certain nutrient, then the parameter list and subsequent Verification Report and Statement can be adjusted accordingly. The Vendor may also seek verification with respect to parameters not listed in Table I. Those parameters shall be specified in the Test Plan. Table II lists optional parameters the Vendor may want included in the Test Plan. This is a partial listing and does not exclude other parameters suggested by the Vendor.

TABLE I: SAMPLING MATRIX**EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE VERIFICATION OF WASTEWATER NUTRIENT
REDUCTION TECHNOLOGIES**

<u>PARAMETER</u>	<u>SAMPLE TYPE</u>	<u>SAMPLE LOCATION</u>		<u>TESTING LOCATION</u>
		<u>RAW INFLUENT</u>	<u>TREATED EFFLUENT</u>	
BOD	24 Hour composite	√		Laboratory
CBOD ₅	24 Hour composite		√	Laboratory
Suspended Solids	24 Hour composite	√	√	Laboratory
pH	Grab	√	√	Test Site
Temperature (°C)	Grab	√	√	Test Site
Alkalinity (as CaCO ₃)	24 Hour composite	√	√	Laboratory
Dissolved Oxygen	Grab		√	Test Site
TKN (as N)	24 Hour composite	√	√	Laboratory
Ammonia-N (as N)	24 Hour composite	√	√	Laboratory
Nitrite-N (as N)	24 Hour composite		√	Laboratory
Nitrate-N (as N)	24 Hour composite		√	Laboratory
Phosphorus, Total (as P)	24 Hour composite	√	√	Laboratory
Orthophosphate (as PO ₄)	24 Hour composite		√	Laboratory

TABLE II: OPTIONAL PARAMETERS FOR SAMPLING

**EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE VERIFICATION OF WASTEWATER NUTRIENT
REDUCTION TECHNOLOGIES**

<u>PARAMETER</u>	<u>SAMPLE TYPE</u>	<u>SAMPLE LOCATION</u>		<u>TESTING LOCATION</u>
		<u>RAW INFLUENT</u>	<u>TREATED EFFLUENT</u>	
Oil & Grease	Grab	√	√	Laboratory
Fecal Coliform	Grab	√	√	Laboratory

3.1.3 Influent Flow Pattern

3.1.3.1 Small Residential Systems (up to 1,500 gpd)

The influent flow shall conform to the following pattern as representative of a typical residence(s) scenario:

6 a.m. – 9 a.m.	approximately 35% of total daily flow
11 a.m. – 2 p.m.	approximately 25% of total daily flow
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	approximately 40% of total daily flow

Total daily flow shall be within 100% ± 10% of the rated capacity of the technology undergoing testing based on a thirty (30) day average.

When necessary to account for dilution by precipitation, such as during the evaluation of a free access sand filter, it may be helpful to add chlorides to the sampling matrix.

The Testing Organization shall monitor and record influent flows daily to ensure that the dosing pattern is delivered as specified in this evaluation plan. The Test Plan shall specify the way in which flow rates will be measured (i.e.: totalizer flow meter, rate meter, etc...)

3.1.3.2 Other Systems (1,500-10,000 gpd)

The influent flow shall conform to the following pattern as representative of a typical residential community scenario:

12 midnight – 6 a.m.	approximately 5% of total daily flow
6 a.m. – 9 a.m.	approximately 15% of total daily flow
9 a.m. – 5 p.m.	approximately 40% of total daily flow
5 p.m. – 8 p.m.	approximately 20% of total daily flow
8 p.m. – 12 midnight	approximately 20% of total daily flow

Total daily flow shall be within $100\% \pm 10\%$ of the rated capacity of the technology undergoing testing based on a thirty (30) day average.

Totalizer flows of the influent shall be measured on a monthly basis and instantaneous flows shall be measured during each sampling event. The Test Plan shall specify the way in which each rate will be measured (i.e.: totalizer flow meter, rate meter, etc...)

3.1.4 Stress Testing

3.1.4.1 Small Residential Systems (up to 1,500 gpd)

One stress test shall be performed following every two months of normal operation during the technology evaluation, so that each of the five stress scenarios is addressed during the twelve (12) month evaluation period.

Stress testing shall involve the following simulations:

- Wash-day stress
- Working parent stress
- Low-loading stress
- Power/equipment failure stress
- Vacation stress

Wash-day stress simulation shall consist of three (3) wash-days in a five (5) day period with each wash-day separated by a 24-hour period. During a wash-day, the technology shall receive the normal flow pattern (Section 3.1.3.1); however, during the course of the first two (2) dosing periods per day, the hydraulic loading shall include three (3) wash loads [three (3) wash cycles and six (6) rinse cycles].

Working parent stress simulation shall consist of five (5) consecutive days when the technology is subjected to a flow pattern where approximately 40% of the total daily flow is received between 6 a.m. – 9 a.m. and approximately

60% of the total daily flow is received between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m., which shall include one (1) wash load [one (1) wash cycle and two (2) rinse cycles].

Low-loading stress simulation shall consist of testing the technology for 50% of the design flow loading for a period of 21 days. Approximately 35% of the total daily flow is received between 6 a.m. – 11 a.m., approximately 25% of the flow is received between 11 a.m. – 4 p.m. , and approximately 40 % of the flow is received between 5 p.m. and 10 p.m.

Power/equipment failure stress simulation shall consist of a flow pattern where approximately 40% of the total daily flow is received between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m. on the day when the power/equipment failure stress is initiated. Power to the technology shall then be turned off at 9 p.m. and the flow pattern shall be discontinued for 48 hours. After the 48-hour period, power shall be restored and the technology shall receive approximately 60% of the total daily flow over a three (3) hour period which shall include one (1) wash load [one (1) wash cycle and two (2) rinse cycles].

Vacation stress simulation shall consist of a flow pattern where approximately 35% of the total daily flow is received between 6 a.m. and 9 a.m. and approximately 25% of the total daily flow is received between 11 a.m. and 2 p.m. on the day that the vacation stress is initiated. The flow pattern shall be discontinued for eight (8) consecutive days with power continuing to be supplied to the technology. Between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m. of the ninth day, the technology shall receive 60% of the total daily flow, which shall include three (3) wash loads [three (3) wash cycles and six (6) rinse cycles].

3.1.4.2 Other Systems (1,500-10,000 gpd)

Stress testing shall involve the following simulations:

- Power/equipment failure stress

Power/equipment failure stress simulation shall consist of a flow pattern where approximately 40% of the total daily flow is received between 5 p.m. and 8 p.m. on the day when the power/equipment failure stress is initiated. Power to the technology shall then be turned off at 9 p.m. and the flow pattern shall be discontinued for 48 hours. After the 48-hour period, power shall be restored and the technology shall receive approximately 60% of the total daily flow over a three (3) hour period which shall include one (1) wash load [one (1) wash cycle and two (2) rinse cycles].

3.1.5 Sampling Requirements

3.1.5.1 Location

Samples shall be collected of the raw influent and treated effluent. It may also be necessary or appropriate to collect samples at intermediate points if the equipment/process involves multiple stages. Sampling locations shall be from a pipe location or from a tank/chamber.

For technologies with subsurface discharge, a location must be provided for collecting an effluent sample prior to discharge to the soil system. Given the potential variability in soil characteristics, a wide range of results for nutrient reduction will likely occur if soil systems are taken into account, and it is unlikely that evaluation of the technology will be reproducible. If a particular technology involves the use of a soil system capable of being reproduced from one location to another, then the effluent sample may be collected at a location following the soil system. Natural systems involving features such as ponds, vegetation wetlands, free access or buried sand filters and soil systems must have a single discharge point from which a discreet sample may be taken.

3.1.5.2 Frequency

Samples must be collected at a **minimum** interval of once per month at all sampling locations. The Test Plan shall indicate the sampling frequency to be performed. In addition, a concentrated sampling period of five (5) consecutive days shall be required once per calendar quarter. In addition to the monthly and quarterly sampling schedule, samples shall be collected on the day each stress simulation is initiated and when approximately 50% of each stress test has been completed. Twenty-four (24) hours after the completion of wash-day, working-parent, low-loading and vacation stress scenarios, samples shall be collected for six (6) consecutive days. Forty-eight hours after the completion of the power/equipment failure stress, samples shall be collected for five (5) consecutive days.

3.1.5.3 Type

Sample type (24 hour composite, grab) shall be as indicated in Table I for the various parameters. All composite samples shall be collected proportional to flow or volume.

3.1.6 Sampling Procedures

3.1.6.1 Sample Collection Procedures

The Test Plan shall indicate how the following sample collection procedures shall be performed during performance testing.

- Locate sample collection points

- Set up and place sampling equipment in service to obtain flow proportioned composite samples
- Collect grab samples for those parameters requiring a grab sample analysis
- Add appropriate preservatives to the sample containers and transport all sample containers in a chilled cooler (4°C)
- Document the sample collection points and the sampling event recording all relevant information in the Field Log

3.1.6.2 Sample Labeling and Designation

The Test Plan shall establish the means by which samples will be labeled and uniquely identified.

3.1.6.3 Sample Packing/Shipping Procedures

All samples collected for laboratory analysis shall be shipped to the laboratory on the day of collection, following proper identification, chain-of-custody, preservation, and packaging procedures as established in the Test Plan.

3.1.6.4 Sample Chain of Custody

Test Plans for the evaluation of technologies should specify the means by which sample chain of custody will be recorded.

3.1.6.5 Field Records and Documentation

A Field Log shall be prepared and maintained throughout the course of the evaluation by the Testing organization or a qualified designee. The Field Log will be turned in to EvTEC for copying/filing/tracking when complete.

Field Log entries shall be recorded on a permanent medium. If errors are made in any Field Log, chain-of-custody record, or any other field record document, corrections may be made by crossing a single line through the error, entering the correct information, initialing, and dating the correction.

All entries in Field Log shall be legible and contain accurate and inclusive documentation of all project activities. Once completed, the Field Log becomes an accountable document and must be maintained as part of the project files.

The Test Plan shall include the qualifications of all persons involved in Field Log entries, chain-of-custody records or any other field record documentation.

All aspects of sample collection and handling, as well as visual observations, shall be documented in the Field Log. All sample collection equipment (where appropriate), field analytical equipment, and equipment used to make physical measurements shall be identified in the Field Log. All calculations, results, and calibration data for field sampling, field analytical, and field physical measurement equipment shall also be recorded in the Field Log, except where these are referenced as being recorded on approved field forms. All field analyses and measurements must be traceable to the specific piece of field equipment utilized and to the field investigator collecting the sample, making the measurement, or conducting analyses. The Field Log shall be updated as fieldwork progresses.

These following minimum information shall be recorded in the Field Log:

- Date
- Weather Conditions
- Description of the work performed
- List of personnel involved, their position, and respective affiliations
- List of equipment on-site
- Description of decontamination performed
- List of sample I.D. numbers of environmental samples taken, and analyses requested
- The uniquely numbered COCs forwarded, and the recipient
- Identification of problems encountered and/or deviations from the evaluation plan
- Calibrations performed
- Problems encountered and Corrective actions taken

3.1.6.6 Waste Management Plan

Procedures must be developed and implemented to include the proper containerization, characterization, transportation and disposal of wastes. The waste management program shall emphasize the minimization of waste generation and the management of generated wastes in a manner that is protective of human health and the environment.

3.1.7 Analytical Procedures

The methods for the analysis of the parameters in Tables I and II shall be those contained in 40 CFR Part 136, or alternate test procedures approved pursuant to 40 CFR Part 136. The laboratory must be qualified by EvTEC prior to commencement of the evaluation and shall be identified in the Test Plan. The Test Plan shall also provide information on the procedures to be followed during the evaluation process by the approved laboratory (ie:

SOPs). The laboratory shall be certified to perform the required analyses for those test sites in states that have a certification program. For test sites in states without a certification program, it is recommended that the laboratory have NELAC certification, or a suitable substitute.

For testing to be performed immediately at the test site (dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature), the test site personnel shall be trained in the use of the test equipment by the Testing Organization.

3.1.8 Additional Performance Claims

3.1.8.1 Alarm Systems

The nutrient reduction technology may incorporate certain alarm systems to alert the property owner and/or operator of equipment failure, high liquid level, etc.. During the evaluation period, any alarm systems associated with the technology shall be operationally tested and verified at least once per month. The Test Plan shall describe the means by which alarm systems are to be evaluated.

3.1.8.2 Other

The Vendor may have additional claims relative to the performance or functioning of the technology to be evaluated during the test period. The Test Plan must specifically address the means by which additional claims will be verified.

3.2 Operation and Maintenance Considerations

3.2.1 General

Installation and operation and maintenance requirements for the technology shall be overseen by the Testing Organization, with assistance from the Vendor, if necessary, and shall be performed in accordance with the Vendor's written instructions. The Test Plan shall address how the installation requirements and maintenance performed will be documented during the course of verification testing. The Vendor shall not be permitted to perform operation or maintenance tasks without supervision by the Testing Organization.

3.2.2 Mechanical Components

Wastewater treatment processes may involve the use of compressors or blowers, mixers, and chemical and wastewater pumps. Performance and reliability of the equipment during the test period must be observed and documented, including equipment failure rates, replacement rates, and the existence and use of duplicate or standby equipment. If necessary, the testing period may be extended to a

second year of operation to fully evaluate equipment performance and reliability. This would result in a second verification of the technology, with an increased focus on operation and maintenance issues.

3.2.3 Electrical/Instrumentation Components

Electrical components, particularly those that might be adversely affected by the corrosive atmosphere of a wastewater treatment process, and instrumentation and alarm systems shall be monitored for performance and durability during the course of verification testing. The Test Plan shall indicate the means by which these components are to be evaluated.

3.2.4 Chemical Feed Components

An evaluation must be performed of the materials utilized relative to various chemical feed systems associated with a nutrient reduction process. The Test Plan shall include testing requirements for the verification of component functions such as the chemical feed delivery rate. Such systems may include alkalinity addition to maintain the proper pH level, chemical addition for phosphorus reduction and/or carbon source for denitrification.

3.2.5 Other Components

The Vendor may have additional components relative to the operation and maintenance of the technology to be considered during the test period. The Test Plan shall indicate the means and frequency by which these components are to be evaluated.

3.2.6 Byproducts or Residuals

A nutrient reduction process may involve generation of byproducts or residuals, which will require off-site disposal. Such byproducts or residuals, when generated, may include septage, sludge, ion exchange regenerates/brines, etc.. The quantity and quality of any byproducts or residuals generated during the evaluation process shall be recorded. The volume, mass and other characteristics of the waste products shall be recorded.

3.2.7 Level of Operator Skill and Attention Required

All wastewater treatment plants require periodic operator attention. The Test Plan shall address how the required operation/maintenance tasks, along with an indication of the extent (i.e., hours per month) and level of operator attention required to maintain performance, will be determined and recorded during the verification process.

3.2.8 Electrical Usage

The Testing Organization shall record the monthly energy consumption (kilowatt hours) of the technology. This may require a dedicated electric meter. The intent is to provide information on the power source (either single or three phase), voltage, and the overall electric usage of the technology. If the Vendor claims an energy recovery benefit, then the Test Plan must address the means by which this claim will be verified.

3.2.9 Chemical Usage

Any chemicals added to the technology during verification testing shall be recorded and quantified.

3.3 Environmental Considerations

3.3.1 Noise

Noise levels associated with mechanical equipment (particularly compressors and blowers) shall be verified during the evaluation period. A decibel meter shall be used to determine the noise level at one (1) meter from the source(s) associated with the technology. Any mitigation measures for noise control provided by the Vendor shall be noted. Noise levels shall be measured once during the evaluation, approximately one month after completion of start up period.

3.3.2 Odors

Monthly observations shall be made during the evaluation period with respect to odors generated by the technology. The observation shall be qualitative and shall include odor strength (intensity) and type (attribute). If the treatment system is buried, covered or otherwise has odor containment, the means of ventilating the compartment(s), including any odor treatment systems shall be noted.

3.3.3 Other

The evaluation shall also note any other environmental aspects, which may come to the attention of the Verification and/or Testing Organization during the evaluation period.

3.4 Miscellaneous

3.4.1 Proprietary Issues

The Test Plan shall identify proprietary issues relative to the Vendor's nutrient reduction technology and discuss how they will be addressed during the course of verification testing and reporting.

4.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE / QUALITY CONTROL (QA/QC)

4.1 QA/QC Objectives

Quality assurance and quality control of the equipment calibration, equipment operation, process maintenance, and the measured water quality parameters shall be maintained throughout the verification testing program. The Testing Organization shall prepare a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), for inclusion in the Test plan and for the Verification Testing, that specifies procedures to be followed to ensure the validity of test results and their use as the basis for equipment performance verification.

The QAPP applies to all organizations involved in the Equipment Verification Testing including Testing Organizations and qualified laboratories. The Testing Organization shall have the primary responsibility for ensuring that all individuals involved in the Equipment Verification Testing comply with QA/QC procedures during the course of verification testing, although EvTEC shall determine the Testing Organization and laboratories to be qualified prior to initiation of testing.

The objective of QA/QC is to ensure that strict methods and procedures are followed during testing so that the data obtained are valid for use in the verification of a technology according to this evaluation plan. In addition, QA/QC ensures that the conditions under which data is obtained will be properly recorded so as to be directly linked to the data, should a question arise as to its validity.

The following QA/QC measures shall be addressed in the QAPP:

- Description of methodology for measurement of accuracy;
- Description of methodology for measurement of precision;
- Description of the methodology for use of blanks, the materials used, the frequency, the criteria for acceptable method blanks and the actions to be taken if criteria are not met;
- Description of any specific procedures appropriate to the analysis of the performance evaluation samples. It has to be clear how these samples are going to be used in the verification testing;
- Outline of the procedure for determining samples to be analyzed in duplicate, the frequency and approximate number;
- Description of the procedures used to assure that the data are correct;
- Definition of data to be reported during the verification testing, in terms of analytical parameter type and frequency;
- Listing of techniques and/or equations used to quantify any necessary data quality indicator calculations in the analysis of water quality parameters, microbiological contaminants or operational conditions (e.g., flow rates, mixer speeds, detention times);
- Outline of the frequency, format, and content of self-assessments of the Testing Organization's technical systems;
- Outline of the frequency, format, and content of assessment reports to EvTEC;

- Development of a corrective action plan responding to audit findings;
- Requirement to provide all QC information, such as calibrations, blanks and reference samples, in an appendix to the report. All raw data shall also be reported in an appendix;

4.2 Intended Uses of Acquired Data

The intended uses of the data acquired under this Evaluation Plan are to determine the degree of treatment a nutrient reduction technology achieves during a site-specific testing period by measuring influent and effluent concentrations of selected parameters.

4.3 Analytical Quality Levels and Quality Control Levels

Whether the quality assurance (QA) objectives for the project, as outlined in the QAPP, are met will be determined through the use of quality control (QC) elements assessing precision, accuracy, representativeness, completeness and comparability. Each of the QC elements is discussed in the following section.

4.4 Quality Control Indicators

4.4.1 Precision

Precision is defined as the degree of mutual agreement relative to individual measurements of a particular sample. As such, Precision provides an estimate of random error. Precision is evaluated using analysis of field or matrix spiked duplicates. Method precision is demonstrated through the reproducibility of the analytical results. Relative percent difference (RPD) may be used to evaluate Precision by the following formula:

$$RPD = [(C_1 - C_2) \div ((C_1 + C_2)/2)] \times 100\%$$

Where:

C_1 = Concentration of the compound or element in the sample
 C_2 = Concentration of the compound or element in the duplicate

The Test Plan shall present the precision methods to be employed in the analysis of data generated under the Verification Testing Program.

4.4.2 Accuracy

For water quality analyses, accuracy is defined as the difference between the measured or calculated sample result and the true value for the sample. The closer the numerical value of the measurement comes to the true value or actual concentration, the more accurate the measurement. Loss of accuracy can be

caused by errors in standards preparation, equipment calibrations, interferences, and systematic or carryover contamination from one sample to the next.

Analytical accuracy may be expressed as the percent recovery of a compound or element that has been added to a sample at known concentrations prior to analysis. The following equation is used to calculate percent recovery:

$$\text{Percent Recovery} = (A_r - A_o) / A_i \times 100\%$$

Where:

A_r = Total amount detected in spiked sample
 A_o = Amount detected in unspiked sample
 A_i = Spike amount added to sample.

Accuracy will be ensured in technology evaluation by maintaining consistent sample collection procedures, including sample locations, sample timing, sample handling, and by executing random spiking procedures for specific target constituent(s). The Test Plan shall discuss methods to determine the accuracy of sampling and analyses.

For equipment operating parameters, accuracy refers to the difference between the reported operating condition and the actual operating condition. For operating data, accuracy entails collecting a sufficient quantity of data during operation to be able to detect a change in system operations. As an example, accuracy of flowrate may be the difference between the flow indicated by a flow meter and the flow measured on the basis of volume over time (with a container of known volume and a stopwatch). Meters and gauges must be checked periodically for accuracy. The Test Plan shall discuss means for determining the accuracy of equipment operating parameters.

4.4.3 Representativeness

Representativeness is the degree to which data accurately and precisely represent a characteristic of a population, parameter variations at a sampling point, a process condition, or an environmental condition. Representativeness is a qualitative parameter relating to the proper design of a sampling program. The Test Plan shall describe the means by which the representativeness of samples collected during the technology evaluation will be ensured.

4.4.4 Completeness

Completeness is expressed as the percentage of valid, acceptable data obtained from a measurement process compared to the minimum amount that was needed to draw an accurate conclusion. The Test Plan shall specify the minimum amount of data needed for each of the various testing stages (start-up period, sampling, stress

testing, etc.); however, that amount shall not be less than that provided in this evaluation plan.

4.4.5 Comparability

Comparability is a qualitative parameter expressing the confidence with which one data set can be compared with another. Analytical results are comparable to results from other laboratories as a result of participation in procedures/programs such as the following: use of instrument standards traceable to National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST) or EPA sources; use of standard or validated methodology; reporting of results in consistent units; and participation, as appropriate, in inter-laboratory studies to document laboratory performance. By using traceable standards and validated methods, the analytical results can be compared to other laboratories operating similarly. The Test Plan shall describe the means by which the comparability of data sets generated during the technology evaluation will be ensured.

4.5 Water Quality and Operational Control Checks

Quality control checks provide a means of measuring the quality of the data obtained. This section describes quality control checks for both water quality analyses and equipment operation. The Testing Organization may not need to use all of the checks identified in this section. The selection of appropriate quality control checks depends on the equipment, the experimental design, and the performance goals. The quality control checks to be used in the evaluation of a technology shall be specified in the Test Plan, in addition to discussion of the corrective action to be taken if the quality control parameters fall outside of the evaluation criteria.

4.5.1 Water Quality Data

Following the start up period, the results of the treatment achieved by the nutrient reduction technology being evaluated are interpreted in terms of water quality. Thus, the quality of the sampling and analysis is important. The QAPP shall emphasize methods to be employed for sampling and analysis QA/QC. Some important aspects to be considered are the following:

4.5.1.1 Spiked Samples

The use of spiked samples will depend on the testing program and the target contaminants. If spiked samples are to be used, the Test Plan shall specify the procedures, frequency, acceptance criteria, and actions if criteria are not met.

4.5.1.2 Method Blanks

Method blanks are analyzed for selected water quality parameters to evaluate analytical method-induced contamination, which could cause false-positive results. The Test Plan shall identify the need and procedures for method blanks.

4.5.1.3 Travel Blanks

Travel blanks shall be provided to the analytical laboratory to evaluate travel-related contamination and shall be specified in the Test Plan.

4.5.1.4 Field Duplicate Samples

A field duplicate sample is a second sample collected at the same location as the original sample. Duplicate sample results are used to assess precision, including variability associated with both the laboratory analysis and the sample collection process. Duplicate samples are collected simultaneously or in immediate succession, using identical recovery techniques, and treated in an identical manner during storage, transportation, and analysis.

The procedure for determining samples to be analyzed in duplicate shall be provided in the Test Plan, with the required frequency of analysis and the approximate number. The Test Plan should also discuss the number of duplicate samples to be provided to the laboratory as “blind duplicates”.

4.5.1.5 Performance Evaluation Samples

Performance evaluation (PE) samples are samples whose composition is unknown to the analyst. PE samples are submitted with statistics about each sample that have been derived from the analysis of the sample by a number of laboratories using EPA-approved methods. These statistics include a true value of the PE sample, a mean of the laboratory results obtained from the analysis of the PE sample, and an acceptance range for sample values. PE samples shall be analyzed for selected water quality parameters before the analytical laboratory initiates technology evaluation. Control limits for PE samples will be used to evaluate the method performance of the analytical laboratory. An analytical laboratory that does not meet the control limits shall not be used for verification analyses.

4.5.2 Quality Control for Equipment Operation

The Test Plan shall explain the methods used to check the accuracy of equipment operating parameters and the frequency at which these checks will be performed.

All sampling and analytical instruments to be used at the local test site (i.e., DO meters, dosing system, sampler, etc.) shall be maintained and calibrated by trained test site personnel in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.

4.6 Corrective Actions

Each Test Plan shall include a corrective action plan. This plan must include the predetermined acceptance limits, the corrective action to be initiated whenever such acceptance criteria are not met, and the names of the individuals responsible for implementation. Routine corrective action may result from common monitoring activities, such as:

- Performance evaluation audits
- Technical systems audits

Ultimately, responsibility for project quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) during implementation of this Evaluation Plan rests with EvTEC, specifically the EvTEC Project Manager, with appropriate input from the EvTEC QA/QC Manager. However, immediate QA/QC for individual tasks (e.g. sample collection, handling, preparation, and analysis) rests with the individuals and organization performing the task at hand, as described in this chapter and in Chapters 4 and 6. The EvTEC Project Manager will coordinate oversight and/or audits of these tasks with the Testing Organization Project Manager to ensure that the Test Plan is being executed as written, and that nonconformances are appropriately reported and documented.

Corrective action shall be taken whenever a nonconformance with the Test Plan occurs. Nonconformances can occur within the realm of sampling procedures, sample receipt, sample storage, sample analysis, data reporting, and computations.

5.0 DATA REDUCTION, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING

The analytical data generated by the laboratory shall be reviewed internally prior to submission to Testing Organization and/or EvTEC to assure the usability/validity of the reported results. This internal data review process will consist of data generation, reduction, a minimum of three levels of documented review, and reporting. The data generated by on-site tests (dissolved oxygen, pH, temperature), will not be validated by an independent reviewer. Independent data validation will be performed on definitive data collected, i.e., the laboratory.

The data reduction, review, reporting, and validation procedures described in this section will ensure that (1) complete documentation is maintained, (2) transcription and data reduction errors are minimized, (3) the data are reviewed and documented, and (4) the reported results are qualified. Laboratory data reduction and verification procedures are required to ensure that the overall objectives of analysis and reporting meet method and project specifications.

5.1 Data Reduction

Analytical data are first generated in raw form at the instrument. These data may be in either graphic form or printed in tabular form. Specific data reduction procedures, generation procedures, and calculations, which convert raw results into a form from which conclusions can be drawn regarding equipment performance, shall be detailed in the laboratory SOPs for each analytical method used. Analytical results shall be reported consistently. Data reduction shall be performed by a laboratory QA/QC Chemist, or qualified designee, who is experienced with the particular analysis and knowledgeable of project QA/QC requirements.

5.2 Data Review

The technician/analyst who generates the analytical data is responsible for the correctness and completeness of those data. This review process involves evaluation of both the results of the QC data and the professional judgement of the person(s) conducting the review. This application of technical knowledge and experience to the evaluation of data is essential in ensuring that high quality data are generated.

The Test Plan shall document the data review procedures which will be followed by laboratory personnel. For example, the data review may be conducted at the laboratory level prior to submittal following this three step process:

5.2.1 Level 1 Technical Data Review

In the Level 1 data review process, the analysts review the quality of their work based on an established set of guidelines. The review will ensure at a minimum that appropriate preparation, analysis, and SOPs have been followed; analytical results

are correct and complete; QC samples are within established control limits; and that documentation is complete (e.g., any anomalies have been documented).

5.2.2 Level 2 Technical Data Review

This level of review will be performed by a supervisor or data review specialist whose function is to provide an independent review of the data package. This review will also be conducted according to an established set of guidelines (i.e., method requirements and laboratory SOPs). The Level 2 review includes a review of qualitative and quantitative data and review of documented anomalies.

5.2.3 Level 3 Administrative Data Review

The final review of the data, prior to submittal, will be performed by the QA/QC Officer or program administrator at the laboratory. This level of review provides a total overview of the data package to ensure its consistency and compliance with project requirements.

5.3 Data Validation

The Testing Organization shall verify that the data forms, data acquisition and reduction are complete and accurate. A field supervisor or another technical member of the Testing Organization shall review calculations and inspect logbooks and data sheets. Laboratory operators shall examine calibration and QC records, verify all instrument systems are in proper working order and ensure that QA objectives have been met.

Analytical outlier data are defined as those QC data lying outside a specific QC objective window for precision and accuracy for a given analytical method. Should QC data be outside control limits, the laboratory supervisor shall notify the Testing Organization and investigate the cause of the problem. If the cause is an analytical problem, the sample will be reanalyzed. If the cause can be attributed to the sample matrix, the result will be flagged with a data qualifier. This data qualifier shall be included and explained in the final analytical report from the laboratory.

The following are examples of validation flags that may be applied to the data:

- U** The analyte was analyzed for but was not detected. The associated numerical value is at or below the method detection limit.
- F** The analyte was positively identified, but the numerical value is below the PQL.
- M** A matrix effect was present.
- B** The analyte was found in the associated blank, as well as in the sample.

- R The data is unusable due to deficiencies in the ability to analyze the sample and meet QC criteria.

5.4 Data Reporting

The laboratory(s) analytical reports shall conform to the following minimum reporting requirements:

- A table, which matches the contract laboratory sample ID to the QA laboratory split sample ID collected. This table also will identify all duplicates and blanks with their corresponding samples.
- A “Cooler Receipt Form” for the purposes of noting problems in sample packaging, chain-of-custody, and sample preservation.
- A copy of the chain-of-custody submitted with the samples.
- Analytical summaries which report results for all samples, blanks, and QC for each analytical fraction. The detection limits are those established by the methods identified and all analytes will be reported. The referenced analytical methods (including preparation methods), date of sample collection, data of extraction, and the date of analysis, as well as any dilution factor, also are required.
- Matrix Duplicates - Relative percent difference (RPD) values will be reported, as well as the project/analyte control limits.
- Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates - The relative percent difference will be reported for each spiked compound. Concentrations for each spiked compound and the method-specific control limits will be reported.

5.5 Project Data Flow and Transfer

Data flow from the laboratory and test site to EvTEC will follow established procedures to ensure that data are properly tracked, reviewed, and validated for use. All test site data and laboratory data packages shall be submitted to the EvTEC Project Manager. No changes to the laboratory data packages will be made without approval from EvTEC. The Test Plan shall describe the format, schedule and means (i.e., electronic format, tables, etc.) for reporting data to EvTEC.

5.6 Reports

Reports will be submitted to EvTEC during the course of the evaluation to ensure that any problems arising during sampling and analysis are investigated and corrected as quickly as possible. The following sections describe the types of QC reports that will be submitted.

5.6.1 Sampling Report

The Testing Organization Project Manager or designee will prepare a report of each sampling event during the evaluation period following all sampling activities. This report will consist of a brief summary of the major actions performed, any problems encountered since the previous report, and corrective actions taken to correct problems. This report will be submitted to EvTEC and will be kept in project files along with the COC forms and the Field Log documenting the sampling activities.

5.6.2 Data Summary Report

The laboratory will provide tabulated summaries of the data to Testing Organization in both electronic and hard copy format. The summaries will show the sample identifiers, the analyses performed, and the measured concentration or effects, including all relevant qualifiers and validation flags. A brief narrative statement on the overall data quality and quantity will also accompany the tabulated summaries. After reviewing the report, the Testing Organization will submit the report to EvTEC. The EvTEC Project Manager and the Testing Organization Project Manager will coordinate with the laboratory project manager to define the format of these data summary reports.

5.6.3 Quality Control and Analytical Report

This report shall be prepared by the Technology Organization and the laboratory and submitted to EvTEC. The report shall be used to address the quality control practices employed during the project. It shall also summarize the problems identified in the sampling reports, which are likely to impact the quality of the data. The following required elements represent the minimum items to be included in the report:

- A project description, including report organization and background information
- Summaries of the sampling procedures, sample packaging, sample transportation, and decontamination procedures.
- A summary of the laboratory analytical methods, detection limits, quality control activities, deviations from planned activities, and a summary of the data quality for each analysis and matrix.
- An assessment of the sampling and analyses techniques, an evaluation of the data quality of each parameter, and an evaluation of the usability of the data.

- A summary of the field or analytical procedures that could be changed or modified to better characterize the raw influent and treated effluent in future evaluations.
- An overall discussion of the quality of the environmental data collected during the evaluation and whether or not it meets the project objectives.
- Identification of the QA samples which were split and sent to the laboratory and to the QA laboratory.
- All cooler receipt and COC forms associated with the required sample results.
- A laboratory case narrative to be included in the results if the sample results are affected by nonconformances or other evaluation events.
- The portion of the primary field sample results and associated batch QC results, which conform to the QA samples submitted to the QA laboratory.

5.7 Use of Existing Data

In general, existing data may not be used as the sole basis for verification. Conditions under which existing data may be used are described in Appendix A. Use of existing data shall be at the discretion and determination of EvTEC. Existing data may be included as a separate section in the Verification Report, but such inclusion shall be clearly indicated as non-quality assured data.

6.0 HEALTH and SAFETY MEASURES

The safety procedures shall address safety considerations, which relate to the health and safety of personnel required to work on the site of the test equipment and persons visiting the site. Many of these items will be covered by site inspections and construction and operating permits issued by responsible agencies. They will include:

- Regulations covering the storage and transport of chemicals.
- Site specific spill response plan with respect to wastewater and any chemical usage.
- Site specific health and safety plan addressing storage and handling of any chemicals.
- Regulations regarding disposal of byproducts.
- Conformance with the National Electric Code.
- Provision of parking facilities, sanitary facilities and drinking water.
- Provision of and access to fire extinguishers.
- Regulations covering site security.
- Conformance to any building permits requirement such as provision of handicap access or other health and safety requirements.
- Ventilation of equipment or of trailers or buildings housing equipment, if gases generated by the equipment could present a safety hazard.

APPENDIX A

ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY VERIFICATION PROGRAM EXISTING DATA: POLICY AND PROCESS

Adapted from Appendix C of the *Environmental Technology Verification Program Quality and Management Plan for the Pilot Period (1995-2000)*, National Risk Management Research Laboratory, National Exposure Research Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Cincinnati, Ohio 45268, EPA Report No. EPA/600/R-98/064.

BACKGROUND

The Environmental Technology Verification program was established by the U.S. EPA for the purpose of verifying the performance of commercial-ready technologies for their ability to monitor, prevent, control, or clean-up pollution. Verification is accomplished by the evaluation of objectively-collected, quality-assured data which are provided to potential purchasers and permittees as an independent and credible assessment of the performance of a technology. Data are collected and evaluated in partnership with independent third party verification partners chosen from the public sector (such as states), the private sector (such as non-profit research institutions), federal laboratories, and others. During the pilot phase (1994-2000), EPA provides oversight of the verification partner to assure the credibility of the process and data, and keeps the authority for the verification process and decision (except in the case of an independent pilot). After the pilot phase, responsibility and authority revert to the verification partner.

The ETV program seeks to identify optimal methods to verify environmental technologies without compromising quality. Stakeholder groups, consisting of representatives of major verification customer groups, advise and assist EPA and the verification partners in this effort. One consistent and urgent request has been that existing data, i.e., data collected prior to the ETV program, be used for ETV verification. This suggestion is reinforced by the programs of individual states, as well as those of other countries, that routinely consider previously-collected data in the verification of vendor claims for a technology. The purpose of this document is to establish a guideline whereby the ETV program may use these “historical,” “existing,” or “secondary” data to increase and enhance the scope of individual pilot projects.

POLICY

Currently, under the U.S. ETV program, the verification partner and the technology developers typically plan and execute tests, which provide the objective and quality-assured data by which the environmental technologies are evaluated. Existing data are used to support test plan development. Measurements and data are collected in a demonstration of the technology by the developer, under the direction of the verification partner, and overseen by EPA. Reports are peer-reviewed and verification statements are issued. In this closely-monitored scenario, the origin and quality of the data upon which the verification statement rests are generally known and documented, and therefore the

possibility for verification decision error is minimized. The consequences of a serious verification decision error can include verification of fraudulent claims, litigation, and loss of credibility for the ETV program, the verification partners, and EPA.

Compelling arguments exist for considering using certain *qualified* existing data to replace some or all of the verification testing for a given technology. Some technologies are time-consuming and expensive to evaluate. Due to resource constraints, demonstrations can, at best, show the performance of the technology under only limited conditions. A test may provide only one small performance snapshot in time as opposed to providing data from several years of performance collected by the developer or his customers under a full range of conditions. Limited resources may require that testing focus on only one component of a technology rather than its full range of capability. Before coming to the commercially viable stage of development, these technologies may have been tested numerous times with acceptably reproducible results.

Judicial precedent provides argument for the defensible use of existing data. In Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., the Supreme Court in 1993 adopted a new standard for the admissibility of scientific evidence. The Court there held that Federal Rule of Evidence 702 requires that, when presented with proposed scientific testimony, the district court must make a preliminary assessment of whether the reasoning or methodology underlying the testimony is scientifically valid, and therefore reliable. The Court declined to adopt a definitive checklist or test, but noted several factors a court should consider. Those factors include: (1) does the theory or technique involve testable hypotheses; (2) has the theory or technique been subject to peer review and publication; (3) are there known or potential error rates and are there standards controlling the technique's operation; and (4) is the method or technique generally accepted in the scientific community? The court must also consider the relevance or fit of the proposed testimony by determining if the reasoning and methodology can properly be applied to the facts at issue.

The Clean Air Act Credible Evidence Revisions (see Federal Register, Vol. 62, No. 36, February 24, 1997) provide precedent within the Agency for defensible consideration of existing data for verification use. These revisions clarify that data from methods which are not EPA Standard Reference Methods can be used in enforcement actions and for compliance certification. Conversely, emission sources will be able to use any credible evidence (ACE) for contesting allegations of noncompliance in enforcement actions. As the rule states, it "exemplifies EPA's common sense" approach to environmental protection, which encourages smarter, cheaper and more flexible means of achieving environmental goals without compromising the fundamental health and environmental protections provided by federal environmental laws." It follows that if EPA can use ACE for enforcement actions, it can be considered for verification.

Other precedent within the Agency exists at the Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards (OAQPS). OAQPS uses secondary data, defined as data that are utilized for a purpose other than that for which they were initially collected, in its regulatory efforts. In order to effectively focus its quality assurance (QA) efforts within the constraints of available resources, OAQPS concentrates its consideration of secondary data according to category of project. The QA activities associated with evaluating secondary data are

conducted to assure that the data will be adequate and sufficient for their planned secondary use.

Recognizing therefore that it is neither prudent nor cost-effective to ignore existing data, the ETV program establishes by this document a consistent process to evaluate these data for the extent of their credibility and usability in the verification decision. Data to be considered for use to replace verification testing undergo a rigorous process of evaluation using stringent criteria. The following *guidelines* are used to qualify existing data for verification purposes (detailed procedures follow in the “process” section of this document):

1. Data are evaluated using qualified reviewers following the data evaluation process established in the “process” section of this document .
2. The documentation of the candidate data is sufficient to allow the reviewers to assess the quality of the data and its usability for verification.
3. The data are evaluated to determine that they meet the same minimum quality acceptance criteria as that collected in a comparable ETV pilot demonstration.
4. All of the data used for a verification must have been objectively collected, independently of the vendor.
5. Only data collected under a well-defined, documented quality system will be considered. Such data sets should contain all the elements required to withstand peer review, and thus be useful for verification.

Recognizing that useful data exist which will not qualify for verification under these guidelines, and responding to customer needs, individual pilots may establish individual evaluation criteria by which existing data may be considered. These data may not be used directly for verification, but may be used, for example, to support planning or to augment verification testing. No ETV program-wide guidelines are necessary for the use of existing data for purposes other than for verification.

PROCESS

Identifying and Qualifying the Data

The vendor proposes the data to be evaluated. EPA and the verification partner shall (with input from the stakeholder group, as applicable) identify for the vendor the procedures and acceptance criteria used in the pilot demonstrations to evaluate technology performance. These procedures and criteria are the same as that used for other technologies evaluated by the verification partner. The data requirements are developed by EPA, the verification partner, and interested stakeholders for the pilot, and are not specific to the existing data. The vendor and verification partner perform the initial evaluation.

The vendor shall provide the verification partner with the detailed protocols and test plans used to develop the existing data. The vendor shall identify those data that he/she believes

will meet the acceptance criteria, qualify those data, and submit the data along with detailed evidence that the data meet the requirements of the pilot project. The evidence shall be submitted to the EPA and verification partner in a detailed report. The report shall show how the data verify the performance of the technology, identify data that were excluded, give an explanation of how and why they were excluded, and address other requirements specific to the pilot project. The vendor shall be prepared to provide all of the raw data.

The verification partner shall review the planning documents to determine whether they meet the requirements of those being used by the verification partner for evaluation tests of other technologies. At a minimum the existing data protocols and test plans shall require the same level of QA/QC, replicate tests, data treatment, and reporting as that required by the verification partner in its technology demonstrations. The verification partner shall conduct a detailed review of the vendor's data report to determine whether the data adequately evaluate the performance of the technology. The verification partner has access to the raw data and works through a reasonable random sample (suggest 10% of the data). A recommended method for evaluation of data is tracing a random selection of data points from the raw data set to the final report.

Minimum General Acceptance Criteria

- The technology is based on sound scientific and engineering principles.
- The conditions under which the data were collected are clearly defined and were appropriate for the demonstration of the capabilities of the technology.
- The data are quality assured. For example, where appropriate, the documentation provides a measure of the bias and precision of the measurements. Where needed, minimum detection limits have been determined and reported. Where applicable, the measurement range of the technology is given. A narrative statement will include a discussion of how well the data represent the capabilities of the technology in its intended environmental application
- Sufficient data are supplied to allow the technology to be verified. Sufficiency of the data will be determined by the reviewers.
- Vendor-generated data may be reviewed as part of the evaluation process because it is a rich source of knowledge about the technology. Only data collected objectively and independently of the vendor, however, may be used to replace verification testing.

Specific Acceptance Criteria

In addition to the general acceptance criteria, the specific pilot project stakeholders may impose specific acceptance criteria which must be as stringent as the acceptance criteria for the data collected during verification testing.

Convening the Data Evaluation Panel

If the verification partner determines that the report does not adequately evaluate the performance of the technology, the vendor is notified and no further action is required. If the verification partner determines that the vendor's report does adequately evaluate the performance of the technology, then a data evaluation panel (DEP) is appointed. The verification partner enlists the services of 3 qualified reviewers to serve on the DEP. During

the pilot phase of the ETV program, the DEP will generally consist of one person from EPA, one person from the verification partner, and one person who is an outside expert in the technology being evaluated. The DEP must contain members who are credible, experienced, knowledgeable, and qualified in the technical areas critical to the technology being evaluated. The members of the DEP must be objective and have no real or perceived conflict of interest with the commercial developer of the technology they are evaluating. DEP members must be independent; they cannot have been involved in the collection of the data being evaluated.

Evaluation of the Data by the DEP

The DEP reviews and agrees on the acceptance criteria and determines their applicability to the data to be evaluated. The evaluation shall follow the procedures and criteria developed by the verification partner and EPA for other technology verifications conducted in the pilot project.

The verification partner provides a written summary of its review to the DEP. When the verification partner submits the data to the DEP, it ceases to be proprietary. The DEP reviews and evaluates the data using the applicable acceptance criteria.. The DEP determines that the data were gathered following appropriate test protocols similar to the protocol used for verification testing. It ensures that the data were gathered following written test plans developed using a similar protocol. Planning must have included specific test objectives, experimental design, criteria for data quality, QA/QC procedures followed and reported, number of samples or frequency of sampling, and sampling and analytical procedures. The DEP must determine that the data quality meets or exceeds the minimum data quality requirements of the verification testing conducted during the pilot.

The quality and usability of the existing data shall be evaluated against clearly defined data quality requirements based on the data quality requirements of the ETV pilot project. The data shall be sufficient to evaluate the performance of the technology.

Recommendations for Acceptance of Data for Verification Role

The DEP shall prepare a report on its findings. At a minimum the report must address the following:

- Was the data collected by following the protocol and test plan provided by the vendor?
- Do the data meet the minimum QA/QC requirements of the ETV pilot project demonstrations?
- Do the data adequately evaluate the performance of the technology? Are there enough data, and are the data of sufficient quality for the verification partner, the ETV program, and EPA to place their reputations on the line?

The DEP provides a written statement of the performance of the technology as provided by the data, a statement of how well the data meet the acceptance criteria, and a data acceptance recommendation.

Review and Acceptance of Recommendation by Verification Partner and EPA

The EPA reviews the report, determines whether to accept the data acceptance recommendation, and signs the verification statement.

@ It is suggested that testing entities having a quality system which is modeled after the American National Standard Institute/American Society for Quality Control (ANSI/ASQC) Standard E-4-1994, *Specifications and Guidelines for Quality Systems for Environmental Data Collection and Environmental Technology Programs*, or the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) Standard 9000, *Quality Management and Quality Assurance Standards: Guidelines for Selection and Use*, may have appropriate quality systems. Other similar quality systems may be accepted at the discretion of the reviewers.

last revised October 8, 1998